

Serial No. 10/707,079

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 was amended.

Claim 17 was objected to for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "the valve stem." Claim 17 was amended to provide antecedent basis for the term "the valve stem."

Claims 1-6, 9-26, and 29-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen '407. Claims 1 and 29 call for a valve mechanism that is slidably displaced by an increasing pressure in the first fluid chamber. Further, claims 1 and 29 call for the sliding valve mechanism to collide against the valve actuating assembly when the increasing pressure reaches the desired blow-off pressure. In the Chen device, there is no sliding of the valve mechanism under increasing pressure in the first fluid chamber below the blow-off pressure. Therefore, there is no collision, nor can there be, of the valve mechanism against the valve actuating assembly at the blow-off pressure. In Chen, there is only sliding of the valve seat or ring member 36 at the blow-off pressure itself. There is no sliding of the valve mechanism (the valve seat 36 and the valve 342) below the blow-off pressure. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1 and 29 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6, 9-26, and 30-38 were rejected as claims 1 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Since claims 2-6, 9-26, and 30-38 depend directly or indirectly from and contain all limitations of claim 1 or claim 29, they are felt to overcome the 102 rejection in the same manner as claims 1 and 29.

Serial No. 10/707,079

Claims 7, 8, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen '407 in view of Wohlfarth '435. The combination of Chen and Wohlfarth fails to teach or suggest a valve mechanism that is slidably displaced by an increasing pressure in the first fluid chamber and configured to collide against the valve actuating assembly when a blow-off pressure is reached in the first fluid chamber switching ~~the valve mechanism from the closed position to the open position as claimed in the present~~ invention. Therefore, the rejection of claims 7, 8, 27 and 28 should be withdrawn.

This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to the comments and suggestions of the Examiner and to place this application in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

WESLING et al.



Lisa J. Wunderlich, Attorney
Registration No. 40,307
SRAM Corporation
1333 N. Kingsbury, 4th Floor
Chicago, IL 60622
(312) 664-3652